



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,758	11/30/2001	Wendy M. Joyner	ROCB-1-1001	6031

7590 07/16/2003
LAWRENCE D. GRAHAM, ESQ.
BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM
816 SECOND AVENUE
SEATTLE, WA 98104

EXAMINER

CHOI, JACOB Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2875

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/997,758

Applicant(s)

JOYNER, WENDY M.

Examiner

Jacob Y Choi

Art Unit

2875

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6 & 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coviello (USPN 5,124,903).

Regarding claims 1 & 2, Coviello discloses first candles (51), the first candle having a first expected burn time, and a second candle (52), the second candle having a second expected burn time, a third candles (53), the third candle having a third expected burn time.

It would have been obvious matter of design choice to change the size of the candle(s), since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a

Art Unit: 2875

component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

In addition, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have plurality of candles, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Note: it is inherent that differently sized or shaped candles would have different burn time

Regarding claim 3, Coviello discloses the claimed invention, explained above. In addition, Coviello discloses a container (15) and wherein the first, second, and third candles are packaged together within the container may to be removed prior to lighting.

Regarding claim 4 & 5, Coviello discloses the claimed invention, except for the candles are either scented or floats. It would have been obvious matter of design variation to modify candles of Coviello, since applicant has not disclosed that the difference solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the most of the candles are either scented or floats.

Note: scented candles are known in the art in illumination and it is inherent that most of the candles floats on water.

Regarding claim 6, Coviello discloses the claimed invention, and it is inherent that differently lengthened candles of Coviello would have burn time. It would have been obvious matter of design variation to modify candles of Coviello so that the first burn time less than 60 minutes, the second burn time is greater than 60 minutes and

less than 120 minutes, and the third burn time is greater than 120 minutes, since applicant has not disclosed that the difference solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears the invention would perform equally well.

Regarding claims 9-13 Coviello discloses the structural limitation as explained above (claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6). In addition, it has been held that to be entitled to weight in method claims, the recited structure limitations therein must affect the method in a manipulative sense, and not to amount to the mere claiming of a use of particular structure. *Ex parte Pfeiffer*, 1962 C.D. 408 (1961).

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coviello (USPN 5,124,903) in view of Pekala et al. (USPN 6,092,932).

Regarding claim 7, Coviello discloses the claimed invention, explained above. In addition, Coviello discloses differently sized candles being packaged (Figure 1). Pekala et al. teaches that the container having a top end and a bottom end, the top end having a plurality of holes, a front side and a back side, a left side and a right side, a lighting element, and a fastener extending through the holes to secure the element to the container and closing the top end of the container. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use modification in Pekala et al., as taught by Coviello in order to package the plurality of candles with a gift bag.

Note: using reusable gift bag of Pekala et al. to package candles would have been obvious because it is understood that a gift may be a many different items and candle(s) is one of the item that may be used as a gift.

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coviello (USPN 5,124,903) in view of Shaffer et al. (USPN 5,551,570).

Regarding claim 8, Coviello discloses the claimed invention, explained above. In addition, Coviello discloses differently sized candles being packaged. Shaffer et al. teaches that it is known to use a decorative packaging system with a lighting element (51) and a means for fastening the lighting element to the container. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use modification in Shaffer et al., as taught by Coviello in order to package the plurality of candles with a gift bag.

Response to Amendment

6. Examiner acknowledges that that applicant has amended claim 6.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 04/23/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the reference of Coviello fail to show pluralities of candles having different burn times which are features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the following features are obvious as reasons stated above and column 1; lines 20-30 of Coviello states that "the term "candle" as used herein is intended to include *conventional wax candles* ... etc." Figure 1 of Coviello clearly shows differently sized candles 51, 52, & 53, where it is known fact / inherent that

Art Unit: 2875

different burn times may be accomplished by varying sizes of the candles (shown in figure 1; 51, 52, & 53), but may also be accomplished by variations in shape, wax compositions or other factors. Accordingly, above described prior art rejections are proper.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob Y Choi whose telephone number is (703) 308-4792. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (10:00-7:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on (703) 305-4939. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)

Art Unit: 2875

872-9318 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-7724.

JC
July 11, 2003



Sandra O'Shea
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800